

DLA Piper Rudnick Gray Cary US LLP 4365 Executive Drive, Suite 1100 San Diego, California 92121-2133

T 858.638.6769 F 858.677.1401

W www.dlapiper.com

ECF

February 4, 2005
VIA HAND DELIVERY

OUR FILE NO. 2103638-6

Hon. Richard Conway Casey United States District Judge Southern District of New York United States Courthouse 500 Pearl Street, Room 1350 New York, NY 10007-1312

USDC SDNY
DOCUMENT
ELECTRONICALLY FILED
DOC #:
DATE FILED: 2-9-05

Re: In re Terrorist Attacks of September 11, 2001, MDL Nol 1570 (RCC); Burnett v. Al Baraka Investment & Development, et al. (03 CV 9849 (RCC))

Also related to Ashton 02CV 6977

Dear Judge Casey:

We are counsel to seventeen defendants.¹ We write in response to the February 3, 2005 letter to the Court from Mr. Kaplan of Motley Rice.

We previously wrote the Court a letter on January 31 in response to a letter application to the Court by the Motley Rice firm (*Burnett* case) dated January 27, as to which we were given no advance notice. We had hoped our prior letter would put an end to the "letter motion" practice by Motley Rice, and open a dialog with plaintiffs' counsel, so that issues arising from the Court's decision of January 18 could be brought to the Court in the orderly manner requested by the Court on January 25. Now we are in receipt of yet another letter to the Court from Motley Rice dated February 3 to which we respond.

In suggesting that the Court simply apply its decision to the *Burnett* case, the Motley Rice firm overlooks that the *Burnett* allegations against our clients materially differ from the allegations in *Federal Insurance* in ways the Court found significant in its January 18 decision. Motley Rice also sidesteps the fact that the issues not resolved in the Court's January 18 decision go well beyond our motions in *Burnett*, and extend to our *Ashton* motion as well as similar issues with allegations in the other multi-districted cases. Moreover, Motley Rice ignores the fact that our six individual clients have motions before the Court upon which the Court has not yet ruled.

We reiterate our point that the proper way to address <u>all</u> these issues is the way the Court directed on January 25: plaintiffs' and defendants' counsel should meet and confer, and then jointly propose to the Court a process for resolving issues remaining open after the January 18

¹ African Muslim Agency, Grove Corporate, Inc., Heritage Education Trust, International Institute of Islamic Thought, Mar-Jac Investments, Mena Corporation, Reston Investments, Safa Trust, Sterling Charitable Gift Fund, Sterling Management Group, York Foundation, Taha Al-Alwani, Muhammad Ashraf, M. Omar Ashraf, M. Yagub Mirza, Igbal Unus, and Jamal Barzinji.



Hon. Richard Conway Casey February 4, 2005 Page Two

decision. We are ready, willing and able to meet and confer with the affected plaintiffs' counsel to reach a joint proposal to fairly present the open issues to this Court.

Respectfully submitted,

DLA Piper Rudnick Gray Cary US LLP

En Me My on boholf of

Jay D. Hanson jay.hanson@dlapiper.com

All Counsel (via email) CC:

SD\1624226.1 2103638-6

The Court has reviewed the January 27,2005 + February 3,2005 Letters from Motley Pice and the January 31,2005 + February 4,2005 Letters from DLA Piper Produck Gray Cary, Day to chrick oversight, the court aid not specifically consider the menuranda in support of the motions to dismiss the Burnt complaint by African Muslim Agent, Grave Corporate, Hritage Education Trust, International Institute of Islamic Mought, Marc Ire Investments, Reston Investments, SAFA TIMST, or York Foundation when it completed its January 18,2005 order. Similarly, it did not consider the memorandum in Export of the motion & dismiss the Ashton completed International Institute of Islamic Trought, Unless the count notified the parties otherwise, it will reading these motions without furter uneling or ord argument.

Filmany 8, 2005 Roberthay